July 13, 1967

Mr. William R. Martin
Counselor At Law
International Trade Mart
New Orleans, Louisiana 70013

Dear Mr. Martin:

I am in receipt of your letter dated July 7. If I interpret your wordage correctly, it appears that you may have misconstrued my reply of June 30, and the reasons behind it. I did not mean to infer by the assessment I gave that I would not continue with the preparation of my case, nor did I mean to foster the impression that there is no additional physical evidence available to substantiate the more essential elements at stake in my case, let alone the fundamental issue involved.

Rather, my assessment pertained strictly to our attorney-client relationship and was based on the assumption that since the particular item of physical evidence was not available, your representation would automatically be terminated (despite the verbiage used in your letter of June 20). In this sense, permit me to remind you that during our last discussion at Springfield you clearly indicated your sole interest in my case was to obtain access to the aforementioned evidence.

Regarding such evidence, I might point out that in my letter dated March 10 and 13 to my sister, both of which were shown to your associate, I emphasized that time was of the essence in transacting

this business discussed therein. And, I feel that if the procedure outlined in my March 13 letter had been followed at the very beginning, the item referred would presently be in your custody . . . for I can assure you that it did not disappear in 1964, nor was it the subject of a burglary by the opposition, notwithstanding what you were told (probably in good conscience) by the witness.

Now, there have been two pertinent and recent developments in my case which call for prompt action on my part, and this is the chief reason I am writing at this time:

Firstly, I have received notification from the Clerk, U. S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, that the appeal composed by court-appointed counsel has been filed and should be heard during the fall session. I fully intend to block such appeal for cause that has been cited previously, namely, Mr. Calamia's advisement last October that if my second conviction is reversed without my being remanded for a third trial, I shall probably be committed civilly to a mental institution, notwithstanding the facts of my mental status as the findings by the U. S. Medical Center for Federal Prisoners.

Secondly, I have received a letter from an attorney who claims he has been retained by Arthur Brenstein to aid me. As I am not yet in communication with Mr. Brenstein I've been unable to confirm this, but there exists no reason to doubt the authenticity of the letter.

Hence, in view of these developments, I ask that you please forward my memorandum in support of petition for habeas corpus to Mr. Brenstein via postal registry; and also, that you send the correspondence relating to Justices Brennan and Kennedy to my sister by registered mail. I

shall, of course, be obliged to pay for the inconvenience and any expenses incurred if you will send the bill to my sister. I believe you are in possession of both her address and that of Mr. Arrentein.

In closing, let me say that I too regret the overall effort was not productive. Perhaps the situation will change in the near future. If it does, I shall certainly keep in mind what you have stated in the last paragraph of your most recent letter.

Would you be so kind as to acknowledge receipt of this letter?

Thank you,

Richard C. Nagell
A-23226-L

P. O. Box 1000
LEAVENWORTH, KANSAS
66048

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
F. B. P.

Mr. William R. Martin
Counselor at Law
International Trade Mart
New Orleans, Louisiana 70113

18 S. P.

D. A.'s office
2700 Tulane Ave.